

ED 030 811

AC 004 650

By-Dunbar, Mary Elizabeth

The Relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' Propensity toward Delegation and Involvement in and Major Responsibility for Leader Identification and Selection.

North Carolina Univ., Raleigh, N.C. State Univ. Dept. of Adult Education.

Pub Date 68

Note-97p.; Masters Thesis.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.95

Descriptors-Evaluation Criteria, *Extension Agents, Identification, *Leadership Responsibility, Masters Theses, *Personnel Selection, Professional Personnel, Role Perception, *Rural Extension, Staff Utilization, Surveys, Volunteers, *Youth Leaders

Identifiers-Four H Clubs, New York State

This research was to determine the relationship between New York State Cooperative Extension 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation of work responsibility and (1) their degree of involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks, (2) assignment of major responsibility for these tasks, and (3) other selected personal and program factors. The sample comprised New York State 4-H Division Leaders in 55 counties. Of the 55 leaders polled, 46 returned usable questionnaires. Based on a review of literature on delegation, 20 administrative factors were selected to elicit 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility. In addition, 18 tasks of leader identification and selection tasks that incorporated planning, executing, and evaluating on a county-wide and local or area basis, were developed. Data revealed that (1) leaders were the most highly involved of all positional groups in tasks of leader identification and selection, and (2) the respondents perceived themselves and 4-H agents to be more highly involved than subprofessionals and voluntary leaders in these tasks. Findings indicated that 12 of the factors used in the study appeared to be significantly associated with the dependent variable, 4-H Division Leaders' propensity to delegate. (author/nl)

ED030811

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 4-H DIVISION LEADERS
PROPENSITY TOWARD DELEGATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN
AND MAJOR RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADER IDENTIFICATION
AND SELECTION

BY

MARY ELIZABETH DUNBAR
DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION

RALEIGH

1968

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN 4-H DIVISION LEADERS' PROPENSITY
TOWARD DELEGATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN AND MAJOR
RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADER IDENTIFICATION
AND SELECTION

by

MARY ELIZABETH DUNBAR

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
North Carolina State University at Raleigh
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Master of Education

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION

RALEIGH

1 9 6 8

APPROVED BY:



Chairman of Advisory Committee

AC 004650

ABSTRACT

DUNBAR, MARY ELIZABETH. The Relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' Propensity toward Delegation and Involvement in and Major Responsibility for Leader Identification and Selection. (Under the direction of ROBERT JOHN DOLAN).

For the 4-H program to be strengthened and expanded more adults need to be involved in non-professional positions releasing professional time for program development and administrative responsibilities. The effectiveness of the 4-H program is highly contingent upon the involvement of adults in leadership positions, utilization of adults in the most appropriate way and the willingness to delegate work to these adults.

The purpose of this research was to determine the relationship between New York State Cooperative Extension 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation of work responsibility and (1) their degree of involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks, (2) assignment of major responsibility for these tasks, and (3) other selected personal and program factors.

Respondents in this research were New York State 4-H Division Leaders in each of the 55 counties presently sponsoring 4-H work. Since 4-H Division Leaders have the responsibility for the conduct of the 4-H program, they were the most likely group to reflect useful information that could be used as a basis for evaluating present staff utilization of certain leader identification and selection processes. Of the 55 4-H Division Leaders polled, 46 returned usable questionnaires.

Based on a review of literature on delegation, 20 administrative factors were selected to elicit 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility. In addition, 18 tasks of leader identification and selection tasks were developed that incorporated planning, executing, and evaluating on a county-wide and local or area basis.

Analysis of 4-H Division Leaders' responses revealed that they were the most highly involved of all positional groups in tasks of leader identification and selection. Data also revealed that the respondents perceived themselves and 4-H agents to be more highly involved than sub-professionals and voluntary leaders in these tasks. Professional groups were perceived to be more highly involved than other positional groups in tasks which are performed on a county-wide basis.

Sub-professionals and voluntary leaders were assigned responsibility for tasks by a relatively small percent of 4-H Division Leaders. In general they were perceived as assuming tasks assigned on a local or area basis than for other tasks.

Findings indicated that twelve of the factors used in the study appeared to be significantly associated with the dependent variable, 4-H Division Leaders' propensity to delegate.

BIOGRAPHY

Mary Elizabeth Dunbar was born in Salamanca, New York, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William H. Dunbar. She and her three sisters, Susan, Betsy, and Sally, spent their formative years in the community of Little Valley, New York, where the author graduated from Little Valley Central School in June, 1956.

The fall of that year she entered the University of Maryland at College Park, Maryland, receiving the Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics with a major in Advertising in 1960.

In January, 1961, the author was employed by the New York State Cooperative Extension Service and the Cattaraugus County Extension Board of Directors as a Cooperative Extension Agent in the 4-H Division. She initiated her graduate studies by attending the University of Georgia winter session in 1964 and summer school at North Carolina State University in 1966 and 1967. September, 1967, she was granted a sabbatical leave from Cooperative Extension to pursue full-time graduate study toward a Master of Education degree in the Department of Adult Education at North Carolina State University at Raleigh, and a minor in Housing at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Robert J. Dolan, Advisor and Committee Chairman, for his interest, guidance, counsel and inspiration given her in the planning and development of this thesis. Appreciation is also expressed to other members of her graduate committee, Dr. Emily H. Quinn and Dr. Jane H. Crow, for their advice and suggestions.

The author is indebted to the New York State Cooperative Extension and the Cattaraugus County Extension Association for granting the sabbatical leave which enabled her to continue her education. Appreciation is expressed to staff members and leaders who assumed added responsibilities in the 4-H Division during the author's leave.

Special thanks is extended to the Cooperative Extension 4-H Division Leaders in New York State, for their assistance and cooperation in providing the data for this study.

And finally, the author is grateful to all persons who have extended continued interest and encouragement to her throughout her graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Research	1
Background Information and Statement of Problem	2
Objectives and Hypotheses of the Study	7
Objectives	7
Hypotheses	8
Methods and Procedures	9
Selection of Respondents	9
Preparation of the Instrument	10
Pretesting the Questionnaire	10
Collection of Data	11
Analysis of Data	11
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK	12
Introduction	12
The Concept of Delegation	13
The Delegation Process	18
Factors Relating to Delegation	22
Reasons Executives Fail to Delegate	22
Reasons Subordinates Fail to Accept Responsibility	24
THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROPENSITY TOWARD DELEGATION AND INVOLVEMENT IN AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADER IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION TASKS	26
Introduction	26
Leader Identification and Selection Tasks	27
Involvement in Tasks	29
Major Responsibility for Tasks	36
Propensity toward Delegation	42
Relationship of Propensity toward Delegation to Independent Variables	45
Involvement in Tasks	46
Major Responsibility for Tasks: Professional and Non-Professional	50
Major Responsibility for Tasks: 4-H Division Leader and All Other Positional Groups	56
Personal and Program Factors	60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	64
Conclusions	64
Implications	68
Recommendations for Future Research	69
LIST OF REFERENCES	70
APPENDICES	72
Appendix A. Definition of Terms	73
Appendix B. Letters and Questionnaire	75
Appendix C. Distribution of Responses According to Degree of Involvement of Positional Groups in Leader Identification and Selection Tasks as Perceived by 4-H Division Leaders . . .	88

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
1. Mean scores and standard deviations based on the degree of involvement of positional groups in leader identifications and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders	31
2. Percent distribution of positional groups according to the assignment of major responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders	37
3. Mean scores and standard deviations based on the frequency that selected factors contributing to delegation occur as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders	43
4. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation to his perceived degree of personal involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks	47
5. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to professional and non-professional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks	51
6. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to Division Leaders and other positional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks	57

Appendix Tables

1. Distribution of responses according to degree of involvement of positional groups in leader identification and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders	88
--	----

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research was to determine the relationship between New York State Cooperative Extension 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation of work responsibility and (1) their degree of involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks, (2) assignment of major responsibility for these tasks, and (3) other selected personal and program factors.

The effectiveness of the 4-H program is highly contingent upon the involvement of adults in leadership positions, utilization of adults in the most appropriate way and the willingness to delegate work to these adults.

Because of the demands by clientele for the professional Extension workers' time, many Extension agents have found it necessary to delegate certain functions to voluntary leaders and more recently to sub-professionals. Two major advantages accrue from this: more Professional time is released for program development and a greater base of resources is made available for attainment of program objectives.

Since 4-H Division Leaders have been assigned the responsibility for administration of the total 4-H effort in each county, it is important that they utilize the delegation process effectively. Delegation of certain functions to other professionals and volunteers releases the 4-H Division Leader for more adequately performing planning, supervisory, training, counseling and other administrative functions.

Findings of this study may indicate the extent to which 4-H Division Leaders utilize the delegation process. The findings may also help determine which positional group in Cooperative Extension work experiences greater involvement and has major responsibility for the tasks of leader identification and selection. In addition, information obtained should serve as a basis for evaluating present leader identification and selection processes in light of future needs.

Background Information and Statement of Problem

Changing economic and social circumstances indicate an increased responsibility of Cooperative Extension and 4-H in helping people meet their needs in a fast changing world. A basic problem exists among Extension workers for developing a clear understanding of measures to extend agent effectiveness in light of growing demands.

Ideally, the educational objectives of the 4-H phase of the Extension program are attained through the efforts of voluntary leaders. It is logical to assume that the effectiveness of the work is largely dependent upon the quantity and quality of available adults to assume leadership positions. It is further evident that the success of the 4-H work is contingent upon the extent to which competent adult leaders can be identified and motivated to assume leadership positions in the 4-H program. (Parker, 1967, p. 2).

One of the Cooperative Extension Service's important contributions to informal adult education is the widespread use of unpaid, local lay leaders. The Extension Committee on Organization and Policy was charged with outlining the scope and responsibilities of the Extension Service in 1959 and designated leadership development as one of nine areas to receive program emphasis. The committee (Extension Committee on Organization and Policy, 1959, p. 37) stated:

Leadership in the Cooperative Extension Service has two dimensions. The Extension worker needs to have a high level of leadership competency to function effectively as a teacher and trainer in a variety of situations. This person must be capable of passing leadership abilities and skills to others.

But extension itself cannot function effectively without the counsel, advice and assistance of a large number of active and effective volunteer leaders. It is imperative, therefore, that we devise better ways of recognizing the potential for leadership and better means of developing and using these activities effectively.

In New York State, volunteer 4-H leadership is the basis of the 4-H program.¹

Regardless of whether the volunteer is leading a club, a special project group, a group of clubs, or is a teacher in a classroom with a 4-H project, they represent the 'Keys to Success' of the total 4-H program.

Yet, according to this committee, 4-H has spent too little time on methods of working with leaders, finding volunteers, defining types and roles of leaders, and other important topics related to leadership. This committee stated that every effort must be made to devote as much energy as possible to the organization of 4-H clubs and to the training of members and leaders. Methods need to be developed for extending programs to new audiences and for seeking new means of maintaining the traditional programs. Extension needs to reach the maximum number of people with the minimum of effort and time. It needs to involve other people in handling the responsibilities for some of the traditional

¹New York State 4-H Ad Hoc Leadership Committee. 1966. Adult 4-H volunteer leadership in New York State. New York State Cooperative Extension, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, p. 1.

programs and activities. By involving other people in reaching new audiences the program may be extended to many and may more adequately utilize professional competencies of the present staff.²

All too often the image of the 4-H leader has been stereotyped, with a general notion that the role involves intensive responsibilities. Progress is being made in recognizing various leadership roles, such as administrative or organizational leaders for the community club; project leaders in specific projects for different age groups; activity leaders in such activities as recreation, demonstrations, and judging; and resource leaders who meet once or twice with a group for a specific purpose. As this concept of leadership involvement is clearly developed, the resource potentials in a community and county become virtually unlimited.

Throughout New York State, 4-H enrollment is annually increasing. In order to expand and provide educational opportunities for more youth, additional support at the local level must be secured to maintain and improve the quality of the program. In identifying and selecting leaders, perhaps the thinking has tended to be restrictive in terms of making the best use of the leadership potential of adults interested in the 4-H program. Areas of leadership, other than just in local clubs, might serve as a medium for increasing opportunities for youth, and involving more people in the program. These other leadership roles

²New York State 4-H Ad Hoc Leadership Committee. 1966. Reaching new audiences. Report of Sub-Committee. New York State Cooperative Extension, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

might be performed by adults of high competency serving as prime resources for club leaders in certain subject-matter or organizational areas. In addition, volunteers or paid sub-professionals may be used within designated areas in the county to promote 4-H club work, identify and select leaders, and organize or reorganize clubs.

Qualified adults might serve as resources for county project groups, County 4-H Councils, and other youth or specialized interest groups. These adults may need training in teaching methods, techniques or organization, and in many other areas. "To be effective, however, the professionals would need to relinquish some functions and merely consult, train or advise."³

As able resource people become involved in the program, they influence the design and enrichment of the 4-H program in the county. Such involvement will be reflected in increasingly meaningful experiences for 4-H members and enhanced opportunities for service and growth of the adult leaders (Mawby, 1966, p. 271).

New York State 4-H agents, as representatives of the land-grant university at the county level, have major responsibility for the conduct of the 4-H educational program. They are responsible for program determination, participant recruitment, public relations, and information.

The 4-H Division Leader is a 4-H agent who has been designated by the State 4-H office as having responsibility for administration of

³Position statements prepared by State 4-H Leader Staff for annual 4-H staff conference, October 28-30, 1963. New York State Cooperative Extension, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, p. 12.

the total effort including staff, program, finances, and facilities. He administers the business affairs of the department; organizes, directs, and supervises professional and non-professional staff; and acts as staff assistant to the 4-H Executive Committee. This person's duties include analyzing economic and social characteristics of the county. He also helps in recommending program objectives, plans and policies for approval by the 4-H Executive Committee and the County Extension Association Board of Directors. The 4-H Division Leader helps plan, organize and direct educational and instructional program and activities which will meet approved Extension objectives; provides county leadership in promoting and implementing program and policy recommendations of Cornell University and insures that activities are internally and externally coordinated.⁴

Educational programs are continually being studied and adopted to meet changing needs.

The involvement of more people, more depth in subject matter, and harder to reach audiences, put ever increasing demands on the abilities of the 4-H Agents. Staff utilization and task delegation are key factors in making decisions concerning the expansion process in youth programs. (MacVean, 1968, p. 4).

Staff utilization needs to be examined in relation to the role of the professionals. Delegation of tasks concerned with leader identification and selection would relieve the 4-H Division Leader for executive

⁴New York State Cooperative Extension Service Position Description. (No date). 4-H C-262. New York State Cooperative Extension, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

duties, leader training, and using his or her time and abilities for making major decisions.

Some questions that are relevant to this study and to which answers were sought were: What is the 4-H Division Leader's propensity toward delegating work responsibility? To what degree are 4-H Division Leaders currently involved in performing certain tasks concerned with leader identification and selection? To whom does the 4-H Division Leader assign major responsibility for performing these tasks? What is the relationship between 4-H Division Leader's propensity toward delegation of tasks concerned with leader identification and selection and the foregoing factors already presented?

Objectives and Hypotheses of the Study

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to determine:

1. 4-H Division Leader's propensity toward delegation.
2. The degree to which 4-H Division Leaders, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders are currently involved in performing leader identification and selection tasks.
3. The degree to which 4-H Division Leaders, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders have been assigned major responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks.
4. The relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and

- a. 4-H Division Leaders' involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks.
- b. 4-H Division Leaders' assignment of major responsibility to positional groups for leader identification and selection tasks.
- c. Selected personal and program factors.

Hypotheses

1. There is a significant relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and
 - a. The degree to which 4-H Division Leaders are involved in performing leader identification and selection tasks.
 - b. The assignment of major responsibility by the Division Leader to positional groups for leader identification and selection tasks.⁵
2. There is a significant relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and the following selected personal and program factors:
 - a. Tenure
 - (1) Years in Extension Service
 - (2) Years in 4-H work
 - (3) Years in 4-H Division Leader Position

⁵ This hypothesis includes two aspects in the assignment of major responsibility: (1) The Division Leader as compared to all other positional groups (agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders) and (2) Professional groups as compared to non-professional groups. (Professional groups include 4-H Division Leaders and agents; the non-professional groups include sub-professionals and voluntary leaders.)

- b. Area of course work taken
 - (1) Number of behavioral science courses
 - (2) Number of leadership courses
- c. County 4-H positional groups
 - (1) Number of professional staff
 - (2) Number of sub-professional staff
 - (3) Number of volunteer leaders
- d. Youth enrollment and potential
 - (1) Number of 4-H members in 4-H clubs
 - (2) Number of 4-H members not in clubs
 - (3) Number of other youth reached by 4-H program
 - (4) Percent increase in 4-H enrollment
 - (5) Number of potential youth 9 - 19 in county
- e. 4-H organizations
 - (1) Number of 4-H clubs
 - (2) Number of special interest groups

Methods and Procedures

Selection of Respondents

The respondents in this research were New York State 4-H Division Leaders in each of the 55 counties presently sponsoring 4-H work. Since 4-H Division Leaders have the responsibility for the conduct of the 4-H program, they are the most likely group to reflect useful information that could be used as a basis for evaluating present staff utilization of certain leader identification and selection processes.

Preparation of the Instrument

The instrument for the study consisted of a mail questionnaire containing four major sections. The first section was designed to secure certain data regarding the 4-H Division Leader and the County 4-H program.

The second section consisted of a scale designed to measure the degree to which the 4-H Division Leader, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and volunteers were involved in carrying out certain tasks concerned with leader identification and selection. Although the degree of involvement scores for the 4-H Division Leader were the only ones used as a variable in this study, it was necessary to collect information on the others stated above to allow the Division Leader an opportunity to compare his involvement with that of others.

In the third section the concern was with determining which positional group the 4-H Division Leader assigned major responsibility for the tasks of leader identification and selection stated in section 2.

Section 4 was designed to elicit 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility.

Pretesting the Questionnaire

Graduate students of the Department of Adult Education at North Carolina State University and faculty members of the researcher's graduate committee were requested to critically review and make an evaluation of the questionnaire. Suggestions obtained from this

pretest were used to revise the questionnaire for maximum clarity and usefulness for a final draft.

Collection of Data

A mail questionnaire was sent to all 55 4-H Division Leaders in New York State. Accompanying this was a letter of explanation concerning the purpose of the research and a request for their cooperation in the study. At the end of a two week period, a second letter was sent to those who had not responded to the questionnaire. Forty-seven questionnaires, or 85 percent, were returned by the respondents; forty-six of these questionnaires were complete. Responses from one questionnaire were considered inadequate and could not be used. The percentage of the returns was considered adequate for the population chosen.

Analysis of Data

Data obtained were precoded and placed on IBM cards for tabulating and analyzing at the Computer Center at North Carolina State University. Frequency counts, percentage distributions, and mean scores were used to analyze the data. Chi square (χ^2) was used to test the statistical significance of relationships between variables. Chi square (χ^2) values at the .05 level of confidence were considered to be significant.

Delegation was used as the dependent variable in the study and was related to independent variables--personal and program factors, 4-H Division Leaders' involvement in, and major responsibility assigned for tasks concerned with leader identification and selection.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

A key, yet time consuming job in the 4-H program, relates to identifying and selecting volunteer adult leaders. This is a continuous process essential for program maintenance and growth. It seems appropriate that as the program expands in depth and in size, professional time should be utilized primarily in an advisory capacity for program development. This raises the question, can persons other than professional staff in a county be designated to assume responsibility for leader identification and selection processes?

In a general frame of reference, Ferguson⁶ states that this is possible if (1) capable people are employed, provided continuous training, and organized into an effective team, and (2) if the administrator delegates responsibility with commensurate authority.

The key to modern delegating is in the word entrust. To entrust or delegate to a person is (1) to surrender the detail to him, (2) with confidence in his ability to do it faithfully (Laird and Laird, 1957, p. 83). By handing details over to people with more know-how: (1) other people's time is saved, and (2) a more adequate job is usually done (Laird and Laird, 1957, pp. 2-3).

In the development of a frame of reference for this study, primary consideration was given to a summarization of literature in personnel

⁶Ferguson, Clarence M. 1967. Delegation--a key to successful administration. Department of Adult Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina, p. 1.

administration and organization relevant to delegation. A fundamental problem in reviewing the literature is language. The terms decentralization, authority, supervision, hierarchy of office, and decision-making have been used diversely in the discussions of delegation.

The Concept of Delegation

Delegation is regarded as a device for releasing the creative potential of personnel at every level. It is viewed as a dynamic two-way process. The concept of delegation is dynamic in that the scope of a subordinate's responsibilities varies according to the stage of growth he has reached. It is two-way in that it stresses services performed by the top for subordinates as well as services performed, vice versa. As an organization grows, the coordinating function of the administrator "may be seen as one which is delegated from the bottom to the top, and the top may be seen as serving those levels which lie beneath it" (Learned and Sproat, 1966, p. 51).

Killian (1966, p. 221) says that:

One of the earliest references to delegation occurs in Genesis (sic)⁷, where Jethro tells Moses, "Choose able men from all the people--and place such men over the people as rulers of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens--and let them judge the people at all times; every great matter they shall bring to you, but any small matter they shall decide themselves; so it will be easier for you, and they will bear the burden for you."

It is generally accepted by experts in the field that delegation

⁷This quotation is taken from the book of Exodus rather than the book of Genesis.

contributes significantly to the efficiency and effectiveness of the organization and to the maintenance of a viable program.

A study of the great business leaders of the United States (Dale and Urwick, 1960, p. 44) indicates there is a relationship between successful delegation of responsibility, and the growth of the organization. The burden of executive work is undoubtedly becoming greater. Causes can be contributed to the increasing size of organizations, the rise in the number of specialized functions, the increase in the complexity of executive functions, and the growing number of general and special interests which clamor for the executive's time.

Van Dersal (1962, pp. 128-129, 130) notes that for an organization to operate at full efficiency, lines of authority, or chains of command, must be known to everyone in the organization. Authority to act should be delegated insofar as possible to the units or individuals nearest the point where the action must take place.

This is further supported by Appleby (1952, p. 243) who says that:

True delegation is a step-by-step, downward assignment or assumption of additional responsibility, every such assignment or assumption being subject to review, control, influence, and revocation at each successively higher level in a centrally identifiable chain of command.

In one way, delegation contributes toward efficiency and effectiveness by relieving the administrator of routine tasks allowing more time for the performance of higher level executive functions. By spending time to carefully plan and exercise delegation, the administrator will not be burdened with the routine, and should be able to devote time to planning, supervision, training, and other important

leadership responsibilities he is expected to handle. Ferguson⁸ states that:

Management consists of many functions among which are: planning, organizing, delegating, supervising, coaching, counseling, directing, motivating, controlling and evaluating. To perform these functions, the successful manager gets many jobs done through others.

Killian (1966, p. 219) defines delegation as sharing the load. He states that "Appropriate delegation is a means to growth, to expanded influence and to increased results through people." This influences the supervisor's capacity for managing a larger responsibility. Killian (1966, p. 221) further points out that the supervisor can then devote more of his time to work which cannot be delegated, and this in turn leads to still further departmental improvement.

Delegation in administration can be a key to success. It puts the best minds to work relieving the executive of routine duties others can assume, so that he may utilize his time and abilities on major decisions.⁹

Organizational efficiency and effectiveness are also enhanced through increased involvement of subordinates in decision-making. The essence of delegating is not only to pass along routine decision-making so that time is released for the executive for making more far-reaching decisions and plans, but also that of helping others to grow and develop by giving them authority and freedom to handle details on their own initiative (Laird and Laird, 1957, p. 90).

⁸Ferguson, op. cit., p. 4.

⁹Ferguson, op. cit., p. 12.

Black (1961, p. 69) points out that delegation develops the feelings of participation. When an employee believes he has contributed his ideas, his experiences, and his talent to the execution of a project, there is an increase in his interest, his satisfaction, and his respect for--and confidence in his superior.

Delegation is discussed in Hill and Egan's book, Readings in Organization Theory, (1966, pp. 395, 375) within the framework that individual subordinates are permitted to make decisions on their own. The decision-making power of subordinates is expanded to permit them to determine means by which goals are to be reached, if not the goals themselves. Detailed instructions are minimized, and subordinates are supervised by results. It is implied that if the job is structured with opportunity for creativity and challenge, then individuals will naturally work harder (Hill and Egan, 1966, pp. 395, 375).

The authors (Hill and Egan, 1966, p. 395) further say that the feasibility of delegation in a given situation may depend (1) on subordinates making adequate decisions once delegation is permitted, (2) on the organization's need for conformity to some common pattern, and (3) on the availability to the supervisor of indirect means by which he can induce subordinates to make adequate decisions and conform to common patterns. Indirect means should include (1) programming: means of letting subordinates know what kind of behavior pattern is desired, (2) controls: means of checking conformance with the pattern, and (3) sanctions: means of inducing compliance with this pattern.

It has been earlier stated that delegation means granting to others the right to make decisions, and to act accordingly. However, this does not relieve the administrator of the responsibility for the performance of those under his supervision. The administrator must be a coordinator working through others to accomplish the organization's purposes and objectives. Litterer (1966, p. 125) states that:

Delegation is not a way of "passing the buck". The amount of freedom the boss gives to his subordinates cannot be greater than the freedom which he himself has been given by his own superior.

This implies that when another person is given authority to do a certain job, the delegator is still accountable for what happens.

There are many ways that authority may be delegated, however responsibility can be only partially delegated. An administrator can delegate responsibility for doing a job, but he still retains responsibility for seeing that it is accomplished. It is this complication that makes delegation so difficult (Stryker, 1955, p. 97).

Authority is delegated in the amount required to satisfactorily perform the assigned task. From top to bottom in a hierarchal organizational structure, delegated authority becomes smaller with each successive level. Although delegation is customarily thought of in this manner, it can be downward, upward or sidewise (Terry, 1964, pp. 363-364).

Supervisors must delegate at various levels of the organization, if members are to become a productive working team. The degree to which a person can use delegation as a tool of employee development

depends on their authority and the authority of the person to whom they delegate (Black, 1961, p. 71).

Recognized principles related to delegation are:¹⁰

1. Ultimate responsibility cannot be delegated.
2. Dual subordination should be avoided.
3. Authority and responsibility should be coextensive.

The Delegation Process

Pfiffner and Presthus (1953, p. 215) state that delegation is achieved by two methods, changing people's behavior and following appropriate management practices.

According to Ferguson¹¹ the process of delegation has three aspects:

1. The assignment by an executive of duties (planning and doing of specified activities) to his immediate subordinates.
2. The granting of permission (authority) to make commitments, use resources, and take other actions necessary to perform the duties.
3. The creation of an obligation (responsibility) on the part of each subordinate to the executive for the satisfactory performance of the duties.

¹⁰Ferguson, Clarence M. 1968. Lecture notes in ED 601, Theory of Organization and Administration in Adult Education, Department of Adult Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina.

¹¹Ibid.

For effective delegation Terry (1964, pp. 368-371) suggests the following process:

1. Make the potential delegator feel secure.
2. Realize the need for delegation.
3. Establish a work climate free from fear and frustration.
4. Encourage a deep belief in delegation.
5. Tie in with intelligent planning.
6. Determine how the delegator keeps his hand in it.
7. Determine decisions and tasks to be delegated.
8. Choose the delegatee wisely.
9. Delegate authority for the whole job.
10. Give assistance to the delegatee.

Killian (1966, pp. 223-225) claims that delegation actually begins with the ability to (1) analyze and categorize problems and activities in manageable units, (2) analyze capability of subordinates, (3) communicate clearly, (4) develop controls, and (5) to follow up on the activities assigned. For an organization to grow, people must grow with it and accept greater responsibility. Sharing the load enables the supervisor to spread executive leadership, thus multiplying his influences. The consequences of delegation usually result in a quicker and more economical handling of the work, and it develops self-confidence in people.

Ferguson¹² claims that it is usually good business to find the person actually working in the area under consideration and delegate

¹²Ferguson, 1967, op. cit., p. 9.

responsibility to him. Actually he may be more qualified and do a better job. He further states that:

In delegating as far down the line as possible, it is important that the requirements and qualifications for the job be not so high that the one to whom the delegation is made might fail because the job was beyond the person's ability, or his experience is not sufficient to permit him to appreciate all the implications of his decisions or actions.

Given (1966, p. 122) feels that the first and most important step in delegation is to develop a realistic appreciation of the talents and abilities of the men and women you delegate to.

Given (1966, pp. 115-120) lists eight keys to delegation as follows:

1. Discuss the job with subordinates before you ask them to go ahead. Try to remain flexible, but have standards of performance understood.
2. It sometimes helps to have an understanding with subordinates as to what problems they are to report back to you (not details).
3. In some jobs a program of work to be followed is helpful. It can serve as a guide to subordinates as well as to keep administrators on top of what is going on.
4. Get out and see personally what is going on. This is one of the best ways of "staying with" the job you delegate.
5. Ask for written reports if your subordinate is able to write well.
6. Have conferences periodically with subordinates and perhaps others in his group.

7. Acquaint other departments or groups under your supervision with the job being delegated.
8. Do not delegate unpleasant tasks that are your responsibility.

Formal and informal reporting and feedback are an important part of the process of delegation. Subordinates should maintain a clear line of communication to those they are responsible to, keeping them informed of progress, problems encountered, and unanticipated experiences.¹³

Laird and Laird (1957, p. 60) state that supervisors:

. . . must delegate, but watch and lend a helping hand as soon as help is needed. Control and freedom have to be properly balanced: more control while the man is developing, more freedom after he can be trusted with it.

Delegation is not complete until it has been fully accepted by the one to whom it is made. According to Ferguson¹⁴ the person to whom delegation is made must:

1. Know exactly what is expected of him.
2. Know the content of his authority to act.
3. Know to what extent he is free to make decisions and act on them.
4. Understand at what point he needs to check with his superior.
5. Understand the basic policy or policies of the organization which guides his decision-making.

¹³Ibid., pp. 11-12.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 10.

6. Appreciate the degree of accountability which accompanies the delegation.

Factors Relating to Delegation

Killian (1966, p. 221) states administrators cannot be expected to keep track of the details of every task he is responsible for. The more nearly he may try to do this, the more he limits his span of leadership, stifles the growth of the enterprise, and defers the development of leadership in the people of his organization. Killian (1966, p. 222) further states:

Too little delegation is typical of the person that believes to get a thing done right he must do it himself and of the energetic person who often piles one responsibility on another until he succumbs to the pressure of "executive overload." At the opposite extreme is the person who delegates responsibility but forgets he must also delegate authority before results can be achieved. Responsibility is a duty or obligation to act. With it must go the right to act, or authority.

Litterer (1966, p. 72) points out that without delegation no organization can function effectively. Lack of the courage to delegate properly and of the knowledge of how to do it, is one of the most general causes of failure in organization.

Reasons Executives Fail to Delegate

Executives may refuse to delegate for it requires at the least, time and money for training, counseling, experimentation and mistakes. At the outset the executive may be more competent than his subordinates, for he usually has had more experience and is in a position to

be more effective in making decisions due to authority assignment, status, and prestige (Dale and Urwick, 1960, p. 45).

Irrational factors such as the executive's desire for power and the concern of being pushed into a position of declining influence is an important factor working against effective delegation (Dale and Urwick, 1960, p. 46).

In Litterer's (1960, p. 119) book, Organization: Structure and Behavior, potential difficulties are suggested which serve as a frame of reference for analyzing problems. These difficulties are:

1. Some executives feel they can do it better themselves. Only when he accepts the idea that his job requires getting most things done through other people will he be able to make full use of delegation.
2. Lack of ability to direct is another barrier. The executive must (a) think ahead and visualize the work situation, (b) formulate objectives and general plans of action, and then (c) communicate these to his subordinates.
3. Lack of confidence in subordinates.
4. A related obstacle to delegation is the absence of selective controls which warn of impending difficulties. The executive needs some feedback of what is occurring. The control system should not undermine the essence of delegation, however an executive cannot completely abdicate his responsibilities.
5. The executive may have a temperamental aversion to taking a chance. In delegating, the executive takes calculated risks.

However over a period of time it is expected that the gains will offset the mistakes.

All five of these obstacles to effective delegation relate to the attitude of the person delegating. When faced with a specific situation where authority is not being delegated as it should, one should look for reasons why the executive is reluctant to turn over authority to someone else.

With respect to poor delegation, perhaps one of the most important factors is inadequate communication. Another factor, as one advances up the executive ladder, is the adjustment from being a doer to one who gets things done through other people (Heyel, 1960, p. 135).

Reasons Subordinates Fail to Accept Responsibility

Subordinates may tend to identify with their superiors to the extent of being dependent on them for direction of their activities.

Dale and Urwick (1960, p. 48) state that subordinates:

. . . are reluctant to accept delegated responsibility when its scope and reasons are not clearly defined, when they are held accountable for errors over which they had no control, and when awards are not tied to improved performance resulting from an increase in responsibilities.

Litterer (1966, pp. 120-121) further discusses why subordinates avoid responsibility.

1. Often a subordinate finds it easier to ask the boss than to make a decision himself on how to deal with a problem.
2. A person will refrain from taking greater responsibility for fear of criticism for mistakes.

3. Most individuals hesitate accepting responsibility when they believe they lack adequate information and resources to do a good job.
4. A subordinate may already have more work to do than he can handle. If overburdened he may be reluctant to accept responsibilities that call for thinking and initiative.
5. Lack of self-confidence stands in the way of some individuals accepting responsibility.
6. Positive incentives which may be tangible or intangible may not be adequate to serve as incentives. These inducements take numerous forms, such as pay increases, recognized status in the organization, change in title, and additional power. It is important that a subordinate affected by delegation be provided with a positive incentive which is important to him.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROPENSITY TOWARD DELEGATION
AND INVOLVEMENT IN AND RESPONSIBILITY FOR LEADER
IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION TASKS

Introduction

County 4-H Division Leaders in New York State are assigned responsibility for administering the efforts of the 4-H Division including staff, program, finances, and facilities. They are the most likely group to reflect information that could be used as a basis for evaluating present staff involvement and assignment for certain leader identification and selection processes. The author presents in this chapter a descriptive analysis and interpretation of data concerned with 4-H Division Leaders' perception toward delegation and selected factors. It is sub-divided into four sections.

In the first section is presented an analysis of 4-H Division Leaders' perception of the degree to which 4-H Division Leaders, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders are currently involved in performing certain tasks concerned with leader identification and selection.

The second section deals with an analysis of 4-H Division Leaders' perception of which of the above positional groups has major responsibility for certain tasks of leader identification and selection.

In the third section an analysis is made of responses to statements reflecting 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility.

Section four contains an analysis of the relationship of 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward adoption and (1) personal

involvement of the 4-H Division Leaders in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks, (2) the assignment of major responsibility for these tasks, and (3) selected personal and program factors.

Leader Identification and Selection Tasks

Appropriate tasks concerned with the identification and selection of leaders were identified, based on a review of the literature and the author's experience. An attempt was made to determine the degree to which Extension workers, sub-professionals, and 4-H voluntary leaders were involved in their respective county at the time these data were collected for each of these tasks. The 4-H Division Leaders were also asked to determine who had major responsibility for each task as presently performed by Extension workers, sub-professionals, and 4-H voluntary leaders. Involvement in and assignment of responsibility for these tasks serve as major variables in later analyses. The eighteen tasks are presented below.

1. Planning for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders for the entire county.
2. Planning for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders for local and area groups (4-H clubs, several communities).
3. Implementing county-wide plans for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.
4. Implementing local or area plans for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.

5. Evaluating on a county-wide basis the process used and results obtained in the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.
6. Evaluating on a local or area basis the process used and results obtained in the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.
7. Studying the program on a county-wide basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.
8. Studying the program on a local or area basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.
9. Identifying on a county-wide basis voluntary leadership that may meet the needs identified.
10. Identifying on a local or area basis voluntary leadership that may meet the needs identified.
11. Training others in the procedures for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.
12. Determining background interests and qualifications of potential voluntary leaders.
13. Consulting with key citizens to determine sources of potential voluntary leadership.
14. Interviewing prospective voluntary leaders to determine their willingness (1) to serve as a leader and (2) to stimulate their interest by providing them information about the job and scope of program.

15. Continuing personal contact with prospective voluntary leader until the individual has made a decision to accept or not accept a leadership position in 4-H.
16. Evaluating the extent to which leader positions have been filled with voluntary leaders who meet the qualifications of specific position they are occupying.
17. Examining the present process being used to identify and recruit voluntary leaders to determine how effective the process is and how the process may be improved.
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved in identifying and selecting leaders.

Involvement in Tasks

The respondents were asked to determine the degree to which the 4-H Division Leader, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders were involved in performing certain tasks relating to the identification and selection of 4-H voluntary leaders. Responses were assigned the following numerical values: Highly involved - 4, Moderately involved - 3, Involved to a low degree - 2, Not involved at all - 1. If the task was not performed by anyone in the county it was not scored.

Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each task for each positional group. Two categories were established for purposes of analysis of involvement in individual tasks as follows: scores from 3.1 - 4.0 were considered as high involvement and scores

1.0 - 3.0 as moderate to low involvement. The standard deviation was used as a measure of dispersion of the responses made on the questionnaire by the respondents. The smaller the standard deviation the greater the amount of consensus among groups for involvement in specific tasks.

The degree of relative emphasis assigned by 4-H Division Leaders to involvement of positional groups in tasks of leader identification and selection is presented in table 1.

It was observed from the data that 4-H Division Leaders were the mostly highly involved of all the positional groups in tasks of leader identification and selection. Rank in involvement based on highest means indicates that over all, the positional groups ranged from high to low degree of involvement in tasks as follows: 4-H Division Leaders, 4-H agents, voluntary leaders, and sub-professionals.

4-H Division Leaders and 4-H agents were perceived to have a high degree of involvement in all of the leader identification and selection tasks. The highest degree of involvement for Division Leaders was noted for the following tasks:¹⁵

- Task 17. Examining present processes utilized to determine the effectiveness and how the processes may be improved.
- Task 7. Determining the numbers and types of leaders needed on a county-wide basis.
- Task 18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved.

¹⁵Tasks above and subsequent tasks in this section are listed from high to low involvement based on mean scores.

Table 1. Mean scores and standard deviations based on the degree of involvement of positional groups in leader identifications and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders

Tasks	Positional Groups ^{a/}							
	Division Leader		Agents		Sub-professionals		Voluntary Leaders	
	M.S. ^{b/}	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.
1. Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis	3.52	.63	3.45	.67	1.80	1.00	1.92	.67
2. Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis	3.26	.70	3.20	.69	2.14	1.14	2.47	.90
3. Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis	3.42	.70	3.24	.66	1.80	1.07	1.60	.67
4. Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis	2.97	.85	3.07	.84	2.18	1.19	2.55	.95
5. Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis	3.46	.85	3.36	.79	1.58	.87	1.57	.75
6. Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or area</u> basis	3.11	1.00	3.12	.97	2.05	1.22	2.12	1.05
7. Determining numbers and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis	3.58	.74	3.50	.73	1.84	.97	1.76	.86
8. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>local or area</u> basis	3.28	.86	3.27	.75	2.21	1.29	2.44	1.09
9. Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide</u> basis	3.47	.72	3.40	.72	1.94	1.05	1.95	.84

Table continued

Table 1 (continued)

Tasks	Positional Groups ^{a/}							
	Division Leader		Agents		Sub-professionals		Voluntary Leaders	
	M.S. ^{b/}	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.
10. Identifying potential leaders on local or area basis	3.08	.84	3.09	.83	2.28	1.23	2.75	1.08
11. Training others in leader identification and selecting processes	3.24	1.04	3.18	1.01	1.63	.99	1.44	.58
12. Determining qualification of potential leaders	3.13	.91	3.22	.91	2.17	1.31	2.34	1.07
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership	3.55	.72	3.47	.76	2.05	1.14	2.04	.87
14. Interviewing prospective leaders	3.30	.69	3.45	.76	2.30	1.21	2.20	1.00
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until decision is made to accept or not accept position	3.00	.89	3.20	.92	2.13	1.29	2.11	1.08
16. Evaluating extent new leaders meet qualification of position	3.44	.75	3.36	.78	2.05	1.11	1.86	.88

Table continued

Table 1 (continued)

Tasks	Positional Groups ^{a/}							
	Division Leader		Agents		Sub-professionals		Voluntary Leaders	
	M.S. ^{b/}	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.	M.S.	S.D.
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved	3.73	.68	3.61	.68	2.00	1.16	1.88	.93
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved	3.55	.69	3.36	.74	1.89	.98	1.81	.85

^{a/} See Appendix C for number of 4-H Division Leaders responding to the degree to which each positional group was involved.

^{b/} Mean scores may be interpreted as follows: High - 4, Moderate - 3, Low - 2, and Not involved - 1.

Task 13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership.

Task 1. Planning on a county-wide basis for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.

Division Leaders were least involved in task 4, implementing on a local or area basis plans for the identification and selection of leaders, and task 15, continuing personal contact with prospective leader until a decision is made to accept or not accept position.

4-H agents were noted to be more highly involved in the following tasks than they were in the other tasks included:

Task 17. Examining present process utilized to determine its effectiveness and how the process may be improved.

Task 7. Determining numbers and types of leaders needed on a county-wide basis.

Task 13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership.

Task 1. Planning on a county-wide basis for the identification and selection of leaders.

Task 14. Interviewing prospective leaders.

They were less involved in task 4, implementing on a local or area basis, and task 10, identifying potential leaders on a local or area basis.

Voluntary leaders were noted to be more highly involved in the following tasks than other tasks listed:

Task 10. Identifying potential leaders on local or area basis.

Task 4. Implementing local or area plans for the identification and selection of leaders.

They were least involved in task 11, training others in leader identification and selection processes; task 5, evaluating processes and

results on a county-wide basis; and task 3, implementing plans on a county-wide basis for identification and selection of leaders.

Sub-professionals were perceived by Division Leaders to be more highly involved in the following tasks than other tasks listed:

Task 14. Interviewing prospective leaders.

Task 10. Identifying potential leaders on a local or area basis.

They were least involved in task 5, evaluating processes and results on a county-wide basis, and task 11, training others in leader identification and selection processes.

The relatively narrow range of standard deviations over 1.0 for tasks being performed by 4-H Division Leaders and 4-H agents indicated a high degree of consensus among 4-H Division Leaders concerning their perception of involvement by these two positional groups in leader identification and selection tasks. Standard deviations of 1.04 for Division Leaders and 1.01 for 4-H agents' involvement indicates disagreement among Division Leaders for task 11, training others in the procedures for identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.

A low degree of consensus was present among respondents concerning their perception of the involvement of sub-professionals in tasks concerned with leader identification and selection. The standard deviation for each of the following tasks exceeded 1.0: 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The standard deviations ranged from 1.05 for task 9, identifying potential leaders on a county-wide basis, to 2.13 for task 15, continuing personal contact with prospective leader until a decision is made to accept or not accept the position.

The standard deviations for involvement of voluntary leaders were also greater than 1.0 for tasks 6, 8, 10, 12 and 15. The range was 1.05 for task 6, evaluating processes and results on a local or area basis, to 1.09 for task 8, determining the number and types of leaders needed on a local or area basis.

The analysis of data in table 1 revealed that the respondents perceive themselves (Division Leaders) and agents to be more highly involved than sub-professionals and voluntary leaders in leader identification and selection tasks. The data revealed that the professional groups are perceived to be more highly involved in tasks which are performed on a county-wide basis.

The analysis in general pointed to a low degree of involvement of sub-professionals and voluntary leaders in these tasks.

Major Responsibility for Tasks

Respondents were asked to decide which positional group they perceived had the major responsibility for seeing that each task is performed. They could respond by checking only one of the following categories relating to each task: 4-H Division Leader, 4-H agents, sub-professionals, voluntary leaders, or task not being performed.

Percentage distributions of positional groups according to assignment of major responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders are presented in table 2.

A higher percentage of respondents assigned major responsibility to Division Leaders than to other positional groups for tasks 1, 3, 5,

Table 2. Percent distribution of positional groups according to the assignment of major responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders

Tasks	N	Positional Groups				
		Division Leader	Agents	Sub-professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Not Being Performed
		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1. Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	65	33	0	0	2
2. Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis	46	20	56	9	13	2
3. Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	57	33	6	0	4
4. Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis	46	20	52	13	13	2
5. Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	56	35	0	0	9
6. Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or area</u> basis	46	22	48	4	15	11
7. Determining numbers and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	54	38	0	0	8
8. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>local or area</u> basis	45	24	44	7	16	9

Table continued

Table 2 (continued)

Tasks	N	Positional Groups				
		Division Leader	Agents	Sub-professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Not Being Performed
		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
9. Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide basis</u>	46	48	42	2	4	4
10. Identifying potential leaders on <u>local or area basis</u>	46	15	39	13	29	4
11. Training others in leader identifi- cation and selection processes	46	35	39	0	0	26
12. Determining qualifications of potential leaders	46	26	52	4	7	11
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership	46	35	44	6	6	9
14. Interviewing prospective leaders	46	18	54	15	13	0
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until the decision is made to accept or not accept position	46	30	50	4	7	9
16. Evaluating extent that new leaders meet qualification of position	46	18	52	15	13	2

Table continued

Table 2 (continued)

Tasks	N	Positional Groups				
		Division Leader	Agents	Sub-professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Not Being Performed
		Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved	46	59	35	0	0	6
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved	46	48	28	2	0	22

7, 9, 17 and 18. Also, the majority of tasks on a county-wide basis were seen by 4-H Division Leaders as the responsibility of their group.

Nearly two-thirds saw task 1, planning for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders for the entire county, as the responsibility of 4-H Division Leaders, while one-third saw it as a responsibility of the 4-H agents.

Task 3 concerned implementing county-wide plans for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders. Over one-half of the Division Leaders perceived this as their task while one-third perceived this to be the responsibility of 4-H agents.

More than half of the 4-H Division Leaders perceived their group to have major responsibility for task 5, evaluating on a county-wide basis the process used and results obtained in the identification and selection of voluntary leaders. In comparison, one-third of the 4-H agents were regarded to have the major responsibility for this task.

Studying the program on a county-wide basis to determine the number and types of leaders constituted task 7. Over one-half of the respondents perceived that 4-H Division Leaders were responsible, whereas 38 percent of the 4-H agents were seen as responsible.

Division Leaders and 4-H agents were approximately equally divided in regards to having the major responsibility for task 9, identifying on a county-wide basis voluntary leadership that may meet the needs identified. Forty-eight percent of the respondents assigned major responsibility to the Division Leaders and 42 percent to the 4-H agents.

Close to 60 percent of the 4-H Division Leaders perceived their group as having major responsibility for task 17, examining the present process being used to identify and select voluntary leaders to determine how effective the process is and how the process may be improved. In comparison, over one-third perceived the 4-H agents as having major responsibility for this task.

Task 18 concerned evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved in identifying and selecting leaders. Almost one-half of the Division Leaders assigned their group major responsibility for this task, while slightly over one-fourth assigned the 4-H agents major responsibility. Close to one-fourth claimed this task was not being performed.

In addition there was one other task that was not being highly performed in the counties. Over one-fourth of the respondents said that task 11, training others in leader identification and selection processes was not being performed. It was observed that only professionals were perceived as having this responsibility.

As indicated in table 2, sub-professionals and voluntary leaders were assigned responsibility for tasks by a relatively small percent of 4-H Division Leaders. However, more Division Leaders perceived sub-professionals and volunteer leaders as assuming responsibility for tasks on a local or area basis than assuming responsibility for other tasks. In general, very little variation was observed between sub-professional and voluntary leaders in assignment of the responsibility for tasks.

Propensity toward Delegation

To determine the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility, the Division Leader was asked to respond to a series of 20 administrative factors based on the frequency that these factors occurred. The scale¹⁶ utilized and values assigned were as follows: Always - 4, Usually - 3, Occasionally - 2, and Never - 1. Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each of the selected factors. All factors considered to contribute positively and negatively to delegation within each grouping are listed in table 3 based on mean scores from high to low. For factors listed as contributing positively to delegation, the higher the mean score the more significant was the factor as an indicator of high delegation. For those factors listed as contributing to negative delegation, the higher the score the more significant was the factor as an indicator of low delegation.

4-H Division Leaders perceived themselves as delegating to a high degree based on responses to such positive factors as allowing those supervised to solve their own problems that arise in their work. However, data indicated Division Leaders do not take all of their annual leave which may mean they are attempting to assume more than they can handle effectively themselves.

¹⁶This scale was adapted from Laird, Donald A. and Eleanor C. Laird. 1957. The Techniques of Delegating. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York. Pp. 32-35.

Table 3. Mean scores and standard deviations based on the frequency that selected factors contributing to delegation occur as perceived by 4-H Division Leaders

Factors	M.S. ^{a/}	S.D.
<u>Factors Contributing Positively to Delegation^{b/}</u>		
Allows those supervised to solve problems that arise in their work	3.45	.54
Feels that own supervisor can be consulted concerning help with job	3.28	.71
Utilizes people who have more knowledge, background and experience than self in certain phases of work	2.97	.74
Feels that those supervised have the ability to take over more detailed responsibilities	2.95	.59
Feels there are things others could do instead of self, even if not quite as well at first	2.89	.67
Prepares others to identify and select volunteer leaders	2.80	.74
Informs those supervised about the job responsibilities as Division Leader	2.69	.75
Has time for personal appointments, recreation, study, civic work, etc.	2.50	.59
Takes all of annual leave	2.08	1.12
<u>Factors Contributing to Negative Delegation^{c/}</u>		
Works longer hours than those supervised	3.10	.85

Table continued

Table 3 (continued)

Factors	M. S. ^{a/}	S. D.
Is interrupted on the job because others come with questions or for advice or decisions	2.83	.76
Has unfinished work accumulating	2.52	.75
Takes work home every night	2.20	.66
Has difficulty meeting deadlines	2.09	.58
Must be kept informed of subordinate's detailed job activities	2.09	.87
Gets involved with details that are not necessary in position	2.09	.55
Inclined to be involved in everything that is going on	2.05	.69
Spends working time doing things for others which they could do for themselves	1.94	.44
Enjoys working at details although someone else could do them just as well	1.92	.55
Those supervised feel they should not make work decisions themselves	1.87	.65

^{a/} Mean scores may be interpreted as follows: Always - 4, Usually - 3, Occasionally - 2, and Never - 1.

^{b/} The higher the score the more significant is the statement as an indicator of high delegation.

^{c/} The higher the score the more significant is the statement as an indicator of low delegation.

Among the negative factors, 4-H Division Leaders perceived themselves working longer hours than those they supervised, and were interrupted on the job because others came with questions or for advice on decisions. High scores for these statements are indications that these factors may contribute to low delegation. Two other factors appeared to be indicators of low delegation. They were allowing unfinished work to accumulate and taking work home every night.

Relationship of Propensity toward Delegation
to Independent Variables

The purpose of this section is to present data which will provide insight regarding some of the factors that were assumed to be related with respondents' propensity toward delegation.

Propensity toward delegation scores were computed for each respondent based on the following scale and assigned values: Always - 4, Usually - 3, Occasionally - 2, and Never - 1. The overall mean propensity toward delegation of responsibility score was computed for the 20 administrative factors. Persons whose mean score fell in the range 2.9 - 4.0 were considered to be high delegators and those that fell in the range 1.0 - 2.89 were considered as low delegators.

This study was restricted to those factors considered highly relevant. In order to determine whether the independent variables were significantly related with the Division Leaders' propensity to delegate responsibility, chi-square values were computed. Values at the .05 level or below were considered to be significant.

Only the tasks which were significantly related with the independent variables are discussed in this section. The chi-square values and percent distributions which depict 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation are summarized in tables 4, 5 and 6.

Involvement in Tasks

Division Leaders were asked to indicate the extent to which their positional group was involved in performing certain tasks relating to the identification and selection of leaders. Responses were assigned the following numerical values: Highly involved - 4, Moderately involved - 3, Involved to a low degree - 2, Not involved at all - 1. If the task was not performed by anyone in the county it was not scored.

Mean scores were computed for each Division Leader. Scores ranging from 3.1 - 4.0 were considered indicators of high involvement and scores 1.0 - 3.0, moderate to low involvement.

Table 4 shows the relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived degree of personal involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks. Only one independent variable was found to be significant.

Task 5 - The task, Division Leaders' involvement in evaluating processes and results on a county-wide basis, was significantly related at the .05 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. Fifty percent of the Division Leaders who were high delegators responded they were highly involved in this task, while 50 percent of the low delegates claimed they were highly involved. In addition, 9 percent of the low delegators were involved to a moderate to low

Table 4. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation to his perceived degree of personal involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks

Tasks and Degree of Involvement ^{a/}	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{b/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
1. Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
High	25	48	52	1.12	N.S.
Moderate to Low	16	31	69		
2. Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis					
High	17	47	53	.37	N.S.
Moderate to Low	24	37	63		
3. Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
High	23	52	48	2.07	N.S.
Moderate to Low	17	29	71		
4. Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis					
High	13	38	62	.03	N.S.
Moderate to Low	29	41	59		
5. Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
High	28	50	50	5.58	.05
Moderate to Low	11	9	91		
6. Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or area</u> basis					
High	21	43	57	.22	N.S.
Moderate to Low	17	35	65		
7. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
High	34	50	50	3.71	N.S.
Moderate to Low	8	12	88		

Table continued

Table 4 (continued)

Tasks and Degree of Involvement ^{a/}	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{b/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
8. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>local or</u> <u>area basis</u>					
High	22	41	59	.07	N.S.
Moderate to Low	19	37	63		
9. Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide basis</u>					
High	28	54	46	3.38	N.S.
Moderate to Low	16	25	75		
10. Identifying potential leaders on <u>local or area basis</u>					
High	17	29	71	2.14	N.S.
Moderate to Low	27	52	48		
11. Training others in leader identification and selection processes					
High	23	48	52	1.29	N.S.
Moderate to Low	11	27	73		
12. Determining qualifications of potential leaders					
High	19	37	63	.07	N.S.
Moderate to Low	22	41	59		
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership					
High	30	50	50	3.35	N.S.
Moderate to Low	11	18	82		
14. Interviewing prospective leaders					
High	28	46	54	.97	N.S.
Moderate to Low	16	31	69		

Table continued

Table 4 (continued)

Tasks and Degree of Involvement ^{a/}	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{b/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until decision is made to accept or not accept position					
High	15	27	73	2.23	N.S.
Moderate to Low	30	50	50		
16. Evaluating extent that new leaders meet qualifications of position					
High	27	41	59	.13	N.S.
Moderate to Low	15	47	53		
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved					
High	37	46	54	.33	N.S.
Moderate to Low	6	33	67		
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved					
High	27	48	52	1.86	N.S.
Moderate to Low	9	22	78		

^{a/} Scores ranging from 1.0 - 3.0 were considered indicators of moderate to low involvement, and scores 3.1 to 4.0 as high involvement.

^{b/} Scores ranging from 1.0 - 2.89 were considered indicators of low delegation, and scores 2.9 to 4.0 as high delegation.

degree while 91 percent of the low delegators fell into this category. The data indicate that there is a relationship between high propensity toward delegation and high involvement in this task.

Since this was the only significant difference found, there appeared to be no relationship between propensity toward delegation and involvement of 4-H Division Leaders in all other leader identification and selection tasks.

Major Responsibility for Tasks: Professional and Non-professional

The data in table 5 show the relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to professional and non-professional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks. Significant differences were found for six of the tasks.

Task 2 - Propensity toward delegation was significantly related at the .05 level of confidence with the assignment of major responsibility for the task, planning on a local or area basis for the identification and selection of voluntary leaders.

Of those 4-H Division Leaders that assigned major responsibility to the professional staff for planning on a local or area basis, 34 percent were high delegators and 66 percent, low delegators. Seventy percent of the respondents who assigned major responsibility to non-professionals were high delegators and 30 percent low delegators.

Task 4 - Data in table 5 indicate that assignment of major responsibility for task 4, implementing on a local or area basis was significantly related with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation

Table 5. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to professional and non-professional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
1. Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Professional ^{b/}	45	42	58	.00	N.S.
Non-professional ^{c/}	0	0	0		
2. Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Professional	35	34	66	4.06	.05
Non-professional	10	70	30		
3. Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Professional	41	44	56	.12	N.S.
Non-professional	3	33	67		
4. Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Professional	33	33	67	4.00	.05
Non-professional	12	67	33		
5. Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Professional	42	40	60	.00	N.S.
Non-professional	0	0	0		
6. Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Professional	32	34	66	3.01	N.S.
Non-professional	9	67	33		
7. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Professional	42	43	57	.00	N.S.
Non-professional	0	0	0		

Table continued

Table 5 (continued)

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
8. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Professional ^{b/}	31	29	71	5.33	.05
Non-professional ^{c/}	10	70	30		
9. Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Professional	41	42	58	.72	N.S.
Non-professional	3	67	33		
10. Identifying potential leaders on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Professional	25	24	76	8.68	.01
Non-professional	19	68	32		
11. Training others in leader identification and selec- tion processes					
Professional	34	41	59	.00	N.S.
Non-professional	0	0	0		
12. Determining qualifications of potential leaders					
Professional	36	31	69	8.89	.01
Non-professional	5	100	0		
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership					
Professional	36	39	61	1.62	N.S.
Non-professional	6	67	33		
14. Interviewing prospective leaders					
Professionals	33	30	70	8.24	.01
Non-professionals	13	77	23		

Table continued

Table 5 (continued)

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until decision is made to accept or not accept position					
Professional ^{b/}	32	34	66	2.79	N.S.
Non-professional ^{c/}	13	62	38		
16. Evaluating extent that new leaders meet qualifications of position					
Professional	37	43	57	.01	N.S.
Non-professional	5	40	60		
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved					
Professional	43	55	56	.00	N.S.
Non-professional	0	0	0		
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved					
Professional	35	43	57	.73	N.S.
Non-professional	1	0	100		

^{a/} Scores ranging from 1.0 - 2.89 were considered indicators of low delegation, and scores 2.9 to 4.0 as high delegation.

^{b/} Professional groups include 4-H Division Leaders and 4-H agents.

^{c/} Non-professional groups include sub-professionals and voluntary leaders.

at the .05 level. Thirty-three percent of the Division Leaders who had a high propensity to delegate assigned major responsibility for this task to the professionals. However, 67 percent of those having a low propensity to delegate assigned major responsibility to this group. Sixty-seven percent of the high delegators assigned responsibility for the task to non-professionals, as compared to 33 percent of the low delegators who assigned responsibility to non-professionals for the task.

Task 8 - Responsibility for determining number and types of leaders needed on a local or area basis was related significantly at the .05 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility. Twenty-nine percent of the Division Leaders who assigned major responsibility to professionals were considered to be high delegators, while 71 percent were considered low delegators. Seventy percent of the high delegators assigned task 8 to non-professionals as compared to 30 percent of the low delegators assigning major responsibility to this group.

Task 10 - There was a significant relationship found at the .01 level between identifying potential leaders on a local or area basis and 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. Twenty-four percent of the 4-H Division Leaders who had a high propensity to delegate assigned this task to professionals as compared to 76 percent of the low delegators. Sixty-eight percent of the high delegators assigned this particular task to non-professionals. Thirty-two percent of the low delegators assigned major responsibility for this task to non-professionals.

Task 12 - Table 5 indicates that major responsibility for task 12, determining qualifications of potential leaders, was significantly related at the .01 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. Thirty-one percent of Division Leaders having a high propensity to delegate assigned major responsibility for this task to professionals, whereas 69 percent of the low delegates assigned major responsibility to this group. All of the high delegators assigned major responsibility for task 12 to the non-professionals.

Task 14 - Assignment of major responsibility for the task, interviewing prospective leaders, was related significantly with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegating responsibility at the .01 level. Thirty percent of the 4-H Division Leaders considered to be high delegators assigned task 14 to professionals, while 70 percent of the low delegators assigned major responsibility to this group. Seventy-seven percent of the high delegators and 23 percent of the low delegators assigned major responsibility for this task to non-professionals.

The data revealed that 4-H Division Leaders who are high delegators tend to assign major responsibility to the non-professional staff. Those with low propensity scores tend to assign responsibility primarily to the professional staff. This relationship was found for four of the five tasks which are concerned with local or area bases. This is indicative that the 4-H Division Leaders who are high delegators are more likely to assign more responsibility to non-professionals on an area or local basis.

Major Responsibility for Tasks: 4-H Division Leader and All Other Positional Groups

Table 6 shows the relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to Division Leaders and other positional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks. Four of the tasks and assigned responsibility were significantly related with the dependent variable.

Task 2 - There was a significant relationship at the .05 level between assignment of major responsibility and 4-H Division Leaders' propensity to delegate for task 2, planning on a local or area basis. Eleven percent of those Division Leaders considered as high delegators and 89 percent of the low delegators assigned major responsibility for this task to their own group. Fifty percent of the high delegators and an equal number of low delegators assigned the major responsibility to other positional groups.

Task 8 - Data in table 5 indicate that the assignment of major responsibility for task 8, determining number and types of leaders needed on a local or area basis was significantly related at the .05 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. Nine percent of the 4-H Division Leaders who had a high propensity to delegate assigned this task to professionals, as compared to 91 percent of the low delegators, who assigned it to Division Leaders. One-half of the high delegators and one-half of the low delegators assigned responsibility to other positional groups.

Table 6. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and his perceived assignment to Division Leaders and other positional groups the responsibility for performing leader identification and selection tasks

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
1. Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Division Leader	30	37	63	1.13	N.S.
Other positional groups ^{b/}	15	53	47		
2. Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Division Leader	9	11	89	4.46	.05
Other positional groups	36	50	50		
3. Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Division Leader	26	42	58	.01	N.S.
Other positional groups	18	44	56		
4. Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Division Leader	9	22	78	1.84	N.S.
Other positional groups	36	47	53		
5. Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Division Leader	26	31	69	2.66	N.S.
Other positional groups	16	56	44		
6. Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Division Leader	10	30	70	.71	N.S.
Other positional groups	31	45	55		
7. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Division Leader	25	40	60	.20	N.S.
Other positional groups	17	47	53		

Table continued

Table 6 (continued)

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
8. Determining number and types of leaders needed on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Division Leader	11	9	91	5.66	.05
Other positional groups ^{b/}	30	50	50		
9. Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide</u> basis					
Division Leader	22	36	64	.83	N.S.
Other positional groups	22	50	50		
10. Identifying potential leaders on <u>local or area</u> basis					
Division Leader	7	0	100	6.32	.05
Other positional groups	37	51	49		
11. Training others in leader identification and selec- tion processes					
Division Leader	16	31	69	1.22	N.S.
Other positional groups	18	50	50		
12. Determining qualifications of potential leaders					
Division Leader	12	17	83	3.56	N.S.
Other positional groups	29	48	52		
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of potential leadership					
Division Leader	16	37	63	.30	N.S.
Other positional groups	26	46	54		
14. Interviewing prospective leaders					
Division Leader	8	12	88	3.78	N.S.
Other positional groups	38	50	50		

Table continued

Table 6 (continued)

Tasks and Assigned Responsibility	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High Percent	Low Percent		
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until decision is made to accept or not accept position					
Division Leader	8	25	75	1.18	N.S.
Other positional groups ^{b/}	37	46	54		
16. Evaluating extent that new leaders meet qualifications of position					
Division Leader	14	21	79	3.93	.05
Other positional groups	28	54	46		
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved					
Division Leader	27	44	56	.00	N.S.
Other positional groups	16	44	56		
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved					
Division Leader	22	36	64	.65	N.S.
Other positional groups	14	50	50		

^{a/} Scores ranging from 1.0 - 2.89 were considered indicators of low delegation, and scores 2.9 to 4.0 as high delegation.

^{b/} Other positional groups include 4-H agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders.

Task 10 - Assignment of major responsibility for identifying potential leaders on a local or area basis was significantly related at the .05 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. One hundred percent of the Division Leaders with low propensity toward delegation assigned major responsibility for this task to Division Leaders. Fifty-one percent of the high delegators and 49 percent of the low delegators assigned major responsibility to other positional groups.

Task 16 - Table 6 indicates that there was a significant relationship at the .05 level between major responsibility for evaluating the extent new leaders meet qualifications of positions and 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation. Twenty-one percent of the Division Leaders who were considered to be high delegators and 79 percent of those who were considered to be low delegators assigned major responsibility for this task to their own group. Fifty-four percent of the high delegators and 46 percent of the low delegators assigned the major responsibility to other positional groups.

There were no significant relationships found between major responsibility assigned and propensity to delegate for other tasks.

Personal and Program Factors

This section contains data relating to the 4-H Division Leaders and County 4-H programs.

Information was obtained regarding 4-H Division Leaders' tenure in Extension, in the 4-H club phase of the program, and in the 4-H Division Leader position. Division Leaders also indicated the number

of undergraduate and graduate courses they had completed in behavioral sciences and leadership. Other data obtained included the size of professional and sub-professional staff as well as number of county volunteer 4-H leaders. Data concerning size of county 4-H program and potential was collected. These data included size of 4-H club membership, number of 4-H members not in clubs, number of other youth reached by the 4-H program, predicted percent increase in 4-H enrollment for the next three years and number of potential youth 9 - 19 in county. Other information obtained was number of 4-H clubs and special interest groups.

Table 7 shows the relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and personal and program variables. Only one independent variable was found to be significant. The variable, number of professional staff members (includes 4-H Division Leader and other 4-H agents) was significantly related at the .01 level with 4-H Division Leaders' propensity to delegate. The data indicate that there is a relationship between high delegation and large staffs.

There were no significant differences found between propensity to delegate and other variables.

Table 7. The relationship of the 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and personal and program variables

Variables	N	Propensity Toward Delegation ^{a/}		χ^2	P
		High	Low		
		Percent	Percent		
<u>Tenure</u>					
Extension Service (Years)					
1-10	24	42	58	.39	N.S.
11-20	14	50	50		
21 and over	8	38	62		
4-H Work (Years)					
1-10	25	55	56	.30	N.S.
11-20	12	50	50		
21 and over	8	38	62		
4-H Division Leader Position (Years)					
1-10	22	50	50	.40	N.S.
11-20	7	42	57		
21 and over	8	37	62		
<u>Area of Course Work Taken</u>					
Behavioral Science Courses (Number)					
0-5	13	54	46	.89	N.S.
6-10	11	36	64		
over 10	20	40	60		
Leadership Courses (Number)					
0-1	35	39	61	.79	N.S.
2 and over	10	54	46		
<u>County 4-H Positional Groups</u>					
Professional Staff (Number)					
1	3	33	67	11.19	.01
2	21	19	81		
3	15	73	27		
4 or more	7	57	43		
Sub-professional Staff (Number)					
0	14	50	50	3.24	N.S.
1-3	21	29	71		
4 or more	10	60	40		

Table continued

Table 7 (continued)

Variables	N	Propensity Toward		χ^2	P
		Delegation ^{a/}			
		High Percent	Low Percent		
Volunteer Leaders (Number)					
1-100	4	50	50	3.73	N.S.
101-200	10	20	80		
201 and over	27	56	44		
<u>Youth Enrollment and Potential</u>					
4-H Members in 4-H Clubs (Number)					
100-1000	32	44	56	1.44	N.S.
1001-2000	7	43	57		
over 2000	4	75	25		
4-H Members Not in Clubs (Number)					
1-200	28	43	57	.62	N.S.
201-400	3	33	67		
over 400	11	55	45		
Other Youth Reached by 4-H Program (Number)					
1-1000	18	33	67	2.18	N.S.
over 1000	23	57	43		
Increase in 4-H Enrollment (Percent)					
1-25%	30	50	50	.80	N.S.
26-50%	8	38	62		
over 50%	6	33	67		
Potential Youth 9 - 19 in County (Number)					
1,000- 9,999	18	28	72	5.25	N.S.
10,000-19,999	9	56	44		
20,000 and over	15	67	33		
<u>4-H Organizations</u>					
4-H Clubs (Number)					
1-50	19	47	53	.04	N.S.
over 50	25	44	56		
Special Interest Groups (Number)					
1-50	37	49	51	.81	N.S.
over 50	4	25	75		

^{a/} Scores ranging from 1.0 - 2.89 were considered indicators of low delegation, and scores 2.9 to 4.0 as high delegation.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between New York State Cooperative Extension 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation of work responsibility and (1) their degree of involvement in the performance of leader identification and selection tasks, (2) assignment of major responsibility for these tasks, and (3) other selected personal and program factors.

The effectiveness of 4-H Division Leaders could be enhanced if other professionals and non-professionals in the county were intensively and extensively involved, utilized in appropriate ways, and delegated responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks.

The concept of delegation was used as a basis for this study. Two major advantages can be derived from delegating certain functions: more professional time is released for program development and a greater base of resources is made available for attainment of program objectives.

Conclusions

1. Based on mean scores, 4-H Division Leaders perceived themselves to be more highly involved than other positional groups in tasks of leader identification and selection. They also saw 4-H agents as more highly involved than non-professionals.

Degree of involvement of sub-professionals and volunteers in tasks as perceived by Division Leaders varied little; however, volunteer leaders appeared to be slightly more highly involved than

sub-professionals. One possible reason why volunteer leaders were perceived as being more highly involved than sub-professionals may be due in part to the fact that the sub-professional concept is relatively new.

All professionals, Division Leaders and 4-H agents were perceived by respondents to be moderately to highly involved. Sub-professionals and volunteers in practically all tasks were perceived to be involved to a low degree.

For leader identification and selection tasks performed on a local or area basis, there was a slight increase in degree of involvement of sub-professionals and voluntary leaders as perceived by Division Leaders.

A high degree of consensus was found among 4-H Division Leaders' perception of their group and 4-H agents' involvement on almost all tasks. Agreement was much lower on the perception of the involvement of sub-professionals and voluntary leaders.

2. The majority of 4-H Division Leaders assigned major responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks to the professional staff. On most tasks sub-professionals and voluntary leaders were not assigned major responsibility. The 4-H Division Leaders were also more likely to assign responsibility to themselves rather than to other professionals and sub-professionals.

There was a tendency for 4-H Division Leaders to assign tasks relating to local or area bases to other positional groups. Although respondents assigned more responsibility to 4-H agents than to non-professional groups, sub-professionals and voluntary leaders were perceived to be more responsible for these tasks than for others.

3. In general, 4-H Division Leaders appeared to have a relatively high propensity toward delegation. This generalization is based on responses to statements included in a scale designed to measure degree of delegation. However, respondents' assignment of major responsibility to 4-H Division Leaders and 4-H agents to the exclusion of non-professionals raises a serious question of the validity of the delegation scale.

4. It was hypothesized that there was a relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and the degree to which 4-H Division Leaders were involved in performing leader identification and selection tasks. Since there was only one significant difference found for propensity and involvement of Division Leaders in these tasks, the hypothesis that a relationship exists was not accepted for 17 of the tasks.

A second hypothesis stated that there was a significant relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and the assignment of major responsibility by the Division Leader to positional groups for leader identification and selection tasks. This hypothesis included two aspects in the assignment of major responsibility:

(a) the Division Leader as compared to all other positional groups (agents, sub-professionals, and voluntary leaders) and (b) professional groups as compared to non-professionals. Professional groups include 4-H Division Leaders and agents; the non-professional groups include sub-professionals and voluntary leaders.

When the professional groups and non-professional groups were compared, this hypothesis was accepted for only 6 of the 18 leader identification and selection tasks. These six tasks dealt with activities conducted on local or area bases. It was found that respondents who assigned major responsibility to the professional staff were also low delegators. Those that assigned major responsibility to non-professionals were more likely to be high delegators.

When 4-H Division Leaders and all other groups were compared, the hypothesis was accepted for only 4 of the 18 tasks.

There was a relationship found between low delegation and assignment of responsibility to 4-H Division Leaders, and consequently a relationship was found between high delegation and assignment of responsibility to all other positional groups.

5. The third hypothesis stated that there is a significant relationship between 4-H Division Leaders' propensity toward delegation and the selected personal and program factors. Only one independent variable was found to be significant. A relationship was found between large staffs and high delegation. Thus, the hypothesis was not accepted for 17 of the tasks.

6. In general, the author concludes that 4-H Division Leaders are very reluctant to assign responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks. Also, the few significant differences noted between propensity toward delegation and independent variables suggests that this area needs to be further explored.

Implications

The analysis of data and conclusions drawn have significance for Cooperative Extension. The author considers the following as important implications:

1. The research study implies that leader identification and selection processes being utilized throughout New York State need further examination. This examination may be done in individual counties by looking at types of planning, executing and evaluation tasks of leader identification and selection presently being utilized on a county level or local or area basis.
2. The findings reveal that there are some Division Leaders that are not utilizing the delegation process extensively. These findings may serve as a basis for identifying a concept that present and prospective 4-H Division Leaders will need to master if the program is to expand and reach a diversified clientele group.
3. Implications may be drawn that courses in leadership development should be provided through inservice training by means of short courses. Graduate courses could be offered at the University level.
4. The use of sub-professionals in the 4-H program is a relatively new concept. There seems to be inconsensus among Division Leaders as to involvement and assignment of leader identification and selection tasks to sub-professionals. If the 4-H program is to be expanded, it is essential that effective use of abilities and contributions of all positional groups be utilized to strengthen the program. Roles of staff members need clear definition and up to date position descriptions need to be formulated.

Recommendations for Future Research

There are several recommendations that may be made concerning further research.

1. Agents', sub-professionals' and voluntary leaders' perception of the 4-H Division Leaders' extent of delegation of responsibility for leader identification and selection tasks to others should be subjected to study.
2. A major area that needs depth study is that of determining why 4-H Division Leaders do not give major responsibility to non-professionals.
3. One may also ask whether or not the findings of this study have transferability to phases of 4-H work other than leader identification and selection.
4. A major concern in this study was that of determining respondents' propensity toward delegation. The author raises the question whether or not the scale used actually measures delegation. It is recommended that the scale be subjected to rigorous validation and reliability tests.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Appleby, Paul H. 1952. *Morality and Administration in Democratic Government*. Louisiana State University Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Black, James M. 1961. *Developing Competent Subordinates*, 2nd ed. American Management Association, Inc., New York.
- Dale, Ernest and Lyndall F. Urwick. 1960. *Staff in Organization*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York.
- Extension Committee on Organization and Policy. 1959. *A Guide to Extension Programs for the Future, the Scope and Responsibility of the Extension Service*. North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, Raleigh, North Carolina, for the various Extension Services and the U. S. Department of Agriculture.
- Given, William B., Jr. 1966. *How to Manage People*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Heyel, Carl. 1960. *Organizing Your Job in Management*. American Management Association, Inc., New York.
- Hill, Walter H. and Douglas M. Egan. 1966. *Readings in Organization Theory: A Behavioral Approach*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, Massachusetts.
- Kelsey, Lincoln D. and Cannon C. Hearne. 1949. *Cooperative Extension Work*. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, New York.
- Killian, Ray A. 1966. *Managers Must Lead*. American Management Association, Inc., New York.
- Laird, Donald A. and Eleanor C. Laird. 1957. *The Techniques of Delegating*. McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York.
- Learned, Edmund P. and Audrey T. Sproat. 1966. *Organization and Policy--Notes for Analysis*. Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois.
- Litterer, Joseph A. 1966. *Organizations: Structure and Behavior*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.
- MacVean, Donald S., Jr. 1968. *A study of New York 4-H agents' perception of the role of the sub-professional in the county 4-H program*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Adult Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina.

- Mawby, Russel G. 1966. 4-H and YMU clubs, pp. 261-275. In H. C. Sanders (ed.), The Cooperative Extension Service. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Parker, Donald C. 1967. The relationship of selected factors to North Carolina 4-H agents' utilization of identification and selection process in developing adult 4-H club leadership. Unpublished Master's thesis, Department of Adult Education, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Pfiffner, John M. and R. Vance Presthus. 1953. Public Administration. The Ronald Press Company, New York.
- Stryker, Peter. 1955. The subtleties of delegation. Fortune Magazine, March, 1955, pp. 94-97, 160-164.
- Terry, George R. 1964. Principles of Management. Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois.
- Van Dersal, William R. 1962. The Successful Supervisor in Government and Business. Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., New York.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. 1956. G. and C. Merriam Company, Springfield, Massachusetts.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Definition of Terms

Sub-Professional--Someone that serves as a paid worker (cash or other) that does not meet the professional qualifications for appointment as an agent. The sub-professional may be a teacher, organizer or recruiter. Their employment is more or less regular and may be full or part time (MacVean, 1968, p. 103).

Volunteer Leader--people selected because of special interest or fitness, to work with some phase of the 4-H program (Kelsey and Hearne, p. 230).

Leader Identification Process--the process of determining who potential and existing leaders are and where they are to be found (Parker, 1967, p. 8).

Leader Selection Process--the process by which leaders are selected, such as by an appointment, group selection, or self-appointment (Parker, 1967, p. 8).

Task--refers to an obligation to perform or a responsibility for performance (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1956, p. 869).

Delegation--means that you give another person authority to do a certain job, but you stay accountable for what happens (Given, 1966, p. 114). Modern delegating is not just getting others to help out on jobs, but also giving them the authority and freedom to handle the details on their own initiative (Laird and Laird, 1957, p. 14).

Propensity--is a tendency, a natural inclination or bend, a favorable disposition or liking (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1956, p. 677).

Assignment of Responsibility--refers to assigning the duty or obligation to act (Killian, 1966, p. 221); a change for which one is reliable or accountable.

Involvement--means to occupy (oneself) absorbingly or engrossingly; to envelop or draw into (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1956, p. 444).

Appendix B. Letters and Questionnaire

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

June 10, 1968

Dear 4-H Division Leader:

I would be most grateful for your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire. The major purpose of this study is to determine the degree certain tasks are utilized in identifying and selecting voluntary leaders. It is hoped that the results will make a contribution to future 4-H program development.

If there presently is not a 4-H Division Leader in your county, will the Extension agent responsible for the 4-H program please complete the questionnaire.

I would appreciate your returning the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope before June 24.

Sincerely,

Mary Elizabeth Dunbar
New York State Cooperative Extension
Agent on leave at North Carolina
State University

Enclosures

DEPARTMENT OF ADULT EDUCATION
NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA

June 26, 1968

Dear 4-H Division Leader:

By the time you receive this letter you may have already completed and mailed the questionnaire I recently sent you asking for your cooperation in a study I am currently conducting. If so, just disregard this letter.

Since there are so few respondents involved in this study to determine the degree certain tasks are being utilized in identifying and selecting volunteer 4-H leaders in New York State, it is important that data be secured from each of the counties that presently have a 4-H program.

I realize there are heavy demands on your time, but I sincerely hope that you will take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

Mary Elizabeth Dunbar

MED: sm

Enclosure

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UTILIZATION OF VOLUNTARY LEADER
IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION TASKS AND CERTAIN FACTORS

General Instructions

1. Please read and answer all parts of the questionnaire carefully.
2. Be sure to comply with the instructions provided within the instrument.
3. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Give your real opinion at all times, because this will be very important in adding to our knowledge of leadership development.
4. All information will be regarded as confidential and will be treated as group data.
5. When you have completed the questionnaire, please check to make sure you have answered all questions.

Definitions

Voluntary leaders are people selected because of special interest or fitness, to work with some phase of the 4-H program. (They will be referred to in this study as 4-H Leaders, persons on advisory groups and sponsoring committees.)

A sub-professional or program aide has been used in many New York counties to perform Extension work. The sub-professional for the purpose of this study is defined as someone who serves as a paid worker (cash or other) but does not meet the professional qualifications for appointment as an agent. The sub-professional may serve as a teacher, recruiter, organizer, etc. Their employment is more or less regular and may be full or part time.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Section I

(Some of the information can be obtained by referring to your 1966-67 annual statistical report.)

1. How many years have you been employed in each of the following categories? (Give numbers)

_____ Extension Service

_____ 4-H Club phase of the program

2. How many years have you served as: (Give numbers)

_____ 4-H Division Leader

_____ Acting 4-H Division Leader

3. How many Cooperative Extension Agents are presently employed in your division in each of the following categories? (Give numbers)

_____ full time

_____ part time

4. How many sub-professionals were employed in your division during the 1966-67 club year in each of the following categories? (Give numbers)

_____ full time

_____ part time

_____ short term worker (including summer assistant)

_____ none

5. How many adults served as volunteer 4-H leaders in the 1966-67 club year in each of the following categories? (Give numbers)

_____ Organizational leaders

_____ Project or subject matter leaders

_____ County project chairmen

_____ Other adult leaders, i.e., activity leaders, resource leaders

_____ Advisory and local sponsoring committees

_____ Total different adult leaders

6. How many youth were either enrolled or involved during 1966-67 in your county in each of the following categories? (Give numbers)

_____ 4-H club members

_____ 4-H members not in clubs

_____ Youth other than 4-H

7. How many different clubs and/or special interest groups were there in your county during 1966-67? (Give numbers)

_____ number of clubs

_____ number of special interest groups

8. Please indicate the approximate number of youth between 9 - 19 years of age in your county.

_____ youth

9. By what percent do you expect your enrollment to increase in the next three years?

_____ percent increase

10. Indicate the number of courses you have completed in each of the following areas:

Undergraduate

Graduate

_____	_____	Sociology
_____	_____	Psychology
_____	_____	Anthropology
_____	_____	Education
_____	_____	Public Administration

11. If you have taken a course(s) in leadership theory or leadership development at the undergraduate or graduate level, please indicate the number of courses taken.

_____ undergraduate

_____ graduate

Section II

In this section are listed tasks which relate to the identification and recruitment of 4-H voluntary leaders.

Please indicate for your county the degree in which Extension workers, sub-professionals and 4-H voluntary leaders are presently performing certain leader identification and selection tasks.

Circle only one number opposite each position which clearly expresses the extent to which the 4-H Division Leader, 4-H Agents, sub-professionals and voluntary leaders are involved in performing the following tasks relating to the identification and recruitment of 4-H voluntary leaders.

<u>Scale</u>		Degree of involvement (Circle one number opposite each position)			
4	Highly involved				
3	Moderately involved				
2	Involved to a low degree				
1	Not involved at all				
<u>Tasks</u>		High	Moderate	Low	Not Involved
1. Planning for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders for the <u>entire county</u> .	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
2. Planning for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders for <u>local and area groups</u> . (4-H clubs, several communities)	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
3. Implementing <u>county-wide</u> plans for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
4. Implementing <u>local or area</u> plans for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1

Scale		Degree of involvement (Circle one number opposite each position)				
4	Highly involved					
3	Moderately involved					
2	Involved to a low degree					
1	Not involved at all					
		High	Moderate	Low	Not Involved	
5.	Evaluating on a <u>county-wide</u> basis the process used and results obtained in the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
6.	Evaluating on a <u>local or area</u> basis the process used and results obtained in the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
7.	Studying the program on a <u>county-wide</u> basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
8.	Studying the program on a <u>local or area</u> basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
9.	Identifying on a <u>county-wide</u> basis <u>voluntary leadership</u> that may meet the needs identified.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
10.	Identifying on a <u>local or area</u> basis <u>voluntary leadership</u> that may meet the needs identified.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1

Scale		Degree of involvement (Circle one number opposite each position)				
4	Highly involved					
3	Moderately involved					
2	Involved to a low degree					
1	Not involved at all					
		High	Moderate	Low	Not Involved	
11.	Training others in the procedures for identi- fication and recruit- ment of voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
12.	Determining back- ground interests and qualifications of potential voluntary leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
13.	Consulting with key citizens to determine sources of potential voluntary leadership.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
14.	Interviewing prospec- tive voluntary leaders (1) to determine their willingness to serve as a leader and (2) to stimulate their interest by providing them in- formation about the job and scope of program.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
15.	Continuing personal contact with prospec- tive voluntary leader until the individual has made a decision to accept or not accept a leadership position in 4-H.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
16.	Evaluating the extent to which leader posi- tions have been filled with voluntary leaders who meet the qualifica- tion of the specific position they are occupying.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
		4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
		Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
		Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1

Scale

- 4 Highly involved
 3 Moderately involved
 2 Involved to a low degree
 1 Not involved at all

Degree of involvement
 (Circle one number
 opposite each position)

		High	Moderate	Low	Not Involved
17. Examining the present process being used to identify and recruit voluntary leaders to determine how effective the process is and how the process may be improved.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved in identifying and recruiting leaders.	4-H Division Leader	4	3	2	1
	4-H Agents	4	3	2	1
	Sub-professionals	4	3	2	1
	Voluntary Leaders	4	3	2	1

Section III

This section is concerned with who has the primary responsibility for seeing that the following tasks are performed.

Check (✓) the person who has the major responsibility for seeing that each task is performed.

Has Major Responsibility
 (Check one)

Tasks

	4-H Division Leader	4-H Agents	Sub-professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Task not Being Performed
1. Planning for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders for the entire county.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Planning for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders for local and area groups. (4-H clubs, several communities)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Has Major Responsibility
(Check one)

	4-H Division Leader	4-H Agents	Sub- professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Task not Being Performed
3. Implementing <u>county-wide</u> plans for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Implementing <u>local or area</u> plans for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Evaluating on a <u>county-wide</u> basis the process used and <u>results</u> obtained in the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Evaluating on a <u>local or area</u> basis the process used and <u>results</u> obtained in the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Studying the program on a <u>county-wide</u> basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. Studying the program on a <u>local or area</u> basis to determine the number and types of voluntary leaders needed.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
9. Identifying on a <u>county-wide</u> basis voluntary leadership that may meet the needs identified.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
10. Identifying on a <u>local or area</u> basis voluntary leadership that may meet the needs identified.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
11. Training others in the procedures for the identification and recruitment of voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
12. Determining background interests and qualifications of potential voluntary leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Has Major Responsibility
(Check one)

	4-H Division Leader	4-H Agents	Sub- professionals	Voluntary Leaders	Task not Being Performed
13. Consulting with key citizens to determine sources of potential voluntary leadership.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
14. Interviewing prospective voluntary leaders to determine their willingness (1) to serve as a leader and (2) to stimulate their interest by providing them information about the job and scope of program.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective voluntary leader until the individual has made a decision to accept or not accept a leadership position in 4-H.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
16. Evaluating the extent to which leader positions have been filled with voluntary leaders who meet the qualifications of the specific position they are occupying.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
17. Examining the present <u>process</u> being used to identify and recruit voluntary leaders to determine how effective the process is and how the process may be improved.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
18. Evaluating the <u>extent</u> to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved in identifying and recruiting leaders.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Section IV

Circle the number under the response which most nearly indicates your situation as expressed in each statement.

Scale

- 4 Always
3 Usually
2 Occasionally
1 Never

	Always	Usually	Occasionally	Never
1. Do you have to take work home every night?	4	3	2	1
2. Do you work longer hours than those you supervise?	4	3	2	1
3. Do you have time for personal appointments, recreation, study, civic work, etc.?	4	3	2	1
4. Do you take all of your annual leave?	4	3	2	1
5. Are you interrupted on the job because others come to you with questions or for advice or decisions?	4	3	2	1
6. Do those you supervise feel they should not make work decisions themselves?	4	3	2	1
7. Do you spend your working time doing things for others which they could do for themselves?	4	3	2	1
8. Do you have unfinished work accumulating?	4	3	2	1
9. Do you have difficulty meeting deadlines?	4	3	2	1
10. Do you feel that you must be kept informed of your subordinate's detailed job activities?	4	3	2	1
11. Do you work at details because you enjoy them although someone else could do them just as well?	4	3	2	1
12. Do you feel there are things someone else could do instead of you, even if not quite as well at first?	4	3	2	1
13. Are you inclined to be involved in everything that is going on?	4	3	2	1
14. Do you feel that the people you are supervising have the ability to take over more detailed responsibilities?	4	3	2	1

Scale

- 4 Always
 3 Usually
 2 Occasionally
 1 Never

	Always	Usually	Occasionally	Never
15. Are you utilizing people who have more knowledge, background and experience than you in certain phases of your work?	4	3	2	1
16. Do you get involved with details that are not necessary in your position	4	3	2	1
17. Do you inform those you supervise about your job responsibilities as Division Leader?	4	3	2	1
18. Do you feel you can consult with <u>your</u> supervisors concerning help with your job?	4	3	2	1
19. Do you prepare others to identify and recruit volunteer leaders?	4	3	2	1
20. Are those you are supervising allowed to solve problems that arise in their work?	4	3	2	1

PLEASE GO BACK AND CHECK YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE
TO MAKE SURE YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Appendix C. Distribution of Responses According to Degree of Involvement of Positional Groups in
Leader Identification and Selection Tasks as Perceived by 4-H Division Leaders

Appendix Table 1. Distribution of responses according to degree of involvement of positional
groups in leader identification and selection tasks as perceived by 4-H Division
Leaders

Tasks	Positional Groups			
	Division Leader Number	Agents Number	Sub-professionals Number	Voluntary Leaders Number
Planning on <u>county-wide</u> basis	42	40	36	38
Planning on <u>local or area</u> basis	42	39	35	40
Implementing on <u>county-wide</u> basis	42	41	35	38
Implementing on <u>local or area</u> basis	43	41	37	40
Evaluating processes and results on <u>county-wide</u> basis	43	41	36	38
Evaluating processes and results on <u>local or</u> <u>area</u> basis	43	41	37	41
Determining numbers and types of leaders needed on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	44	38	43
Determining numbers and types of leaders needed on <u>local or area</u> basis	46	44	38	43
Identifying potential leaders on <u>county-wide</u> basis	46	44	39	43

Table continued

Appendix Table 1 (continued)

Tasks	Positional Groups			
	Division Leader	Agents	Sub-professionals	Voluntary Leaders
	Number	Number	Number	Number
10. Identifying potential leaders on <u>local or area</u> basis	45	44	39	44
11. Training others in leader identification and selection processes	45	44	38	43
12. Determining qualifications of potential leaders	45	44	39	44
13. Consulting key citizens for sources of poten- tial leadership	45	44	39	43
14. Interviewing prospective leaders	46	44	39	44
15. Continuing personal contact with prospective leader until the decision is made to accept or not accept position	46	44	38	44
16. Evaluating extent that new leaders meet qualification of position	45	44	38	43
17. Examining present processes utilized to determine effectiveness and how process may be improved	45	44	38	43
18. Evaluating the extent to which all possible individuals and groups have been involved	45	44	38	43

ERIC Clearinghouse

JUN 30 1969

on Adult Education